



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,599	08/25/2003	Bhavesh Mehta	50269-0558	4272
29989	7590	12/02/2005	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP 2055 GATEWAY PLACE SUITE 550 SAN JOSE, CA 95110			CARLSON, JEFFREY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,599

Applicant(s)

MEHTA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Carlson

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 9/19/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they do not set forth a useful result. MPEP 2106 describes the analysis for such computer-based inventions and specifically states that the claimed invention must provide a useful, concrete and tangible result. Because claim 1 does not necessarily require the instructions to be executed, the claim is not taken to positively set forth a useful result. Mere sending, receiving and/or storing of these instructions does not accomplish a useful result. In this case, *execution* of the claimed instructions would however set forth a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carruthers et al (US2002/0128904).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5-7, Carruthers et al teaches systems and methods for selecting an ad to include with a request for content having an ad slot [¶ 7, 26]. Carruthers et al provides a prioritized master list of ads which provides an order for the ads to be displayed [¶ 34]. Each ad has a delivery criteria that is compared to the slot attribute (for example, the type of user requesting the content – ¶ 38) in order to determine a qualifying subset of ads from the prioritized master list. The ad chosen from the qualifying subset of the master queue is taken to be chosen based upon the sequence of the prioritized queue. Carruthers et al prioritizes the queue of ads based upon priority, a weighting indicating the number of impressions needed and based upon feedback from the system regarding which ads have been shown [¶ 34, 35]. Further, Carruthers et al states that new, proposed campaigns are analyzed and added to the system if they can be accommodated based on the expected ad inventory [¶ 8]. Carruthers et al therefore recognizes that the slot inventory is limited and that all requesting advertisers cannot necessarily be satisfied. Carruthers et al put to use a well known concept of “first-come first served” in that the first advertisers to make ad campaign contracts with the system of Carruthers et al are more likely to be accepted and to get their ads shown by the system than latecomers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have given further improved treatment to early advertisers by employing such a well known “first come, first served” notion and included prioritization of the master list of scheduled ads based upon when

Art Unit: 3622

the advertisers contracted with the system. In this manner, ad campaigns of latecoming advertisers may be accepted into the system, but would be given lower priority (i.e. placed toward the end of the queue) than earlier-arriving advertisers and such latecomers could not steal ad opportunities from earlier-arriving advertisers. Late-arriving advertisers would only be served if ad inventory (available slots) was plentiful enough to fully server the advertisers who came before them. This is consistent with Carruthers et al's disclosure that early adopters will be accommodated, yet late adopters will not. Further, it is pointed out that applicant's system merely lets those at the front of the line dictate how much is left for others behind them in line – much like the well known "first come, first served" approach.

Regarding claims 4, 10, Carruthers et al teaches that ads have delivery constraints such as maximum impressions or time between impressions. If this is the case, the ad is removed from the qualifying subset so that it is not showed again. This is taken to provide a step of including only ads that are not on track to be satisfied and removing all ads whose constraint is "on-track" or has been met.

Regarding claim 9, Carruthers et al teaches that there is another type of ads – default or filler ads. These ads are used when the requesting user is not eligible for any active ads. Also, opportunities for "instant" ads such as when a user performs a search or requests a particular URL are solved by providing such filler ads. This is taken to provide a second priority class of ads to be used when no higher priority ads are available.

Alternatively regarding claims 4, 10, Carruthers et al teaches that each ad has delivery obligations and that determinations are made regarding whether the ad is “on track” or not. Carruthers et al demotes ads if they are on-track or have already met their delivery goals by moving them towards the bottom of the queue [¶ 35]. Carruthers et al states that ads ahead of schedule (i.e. on-track) are “effectively shut-off” by being placed at the end of the queue. Although this is taken to be effectively removed from the list, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have removed such ads from the list entirely in order to ensure only ads that are behind schedule are selected.

Regarding claim 8, Carruthers et al does not appear to specify or restrict the type of content requested to a particular format in order to include the specified advertising. Carruthers et al teaches that the ads can be banner ads or pop-up ads [¶ 15]. Carruthers et al further states that users can access files of various types via the Internet (text, images, video, etc) [¶ 20]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided such advertising associated with any type of electronic content such as a video stream, or even a web page that includes an embedded video stream as is well known, so that advertisers can reach a wide audience and content providers can earn advertising revenue for a variety of pages.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues Carruthers et al does not base the queue order on when the advertiser incurred the delivery obligation (i.e. when the advertisement contract was

Art Unit: 3622

agreed upon). Examiner points out that Carruthers et al does favorably treat newcomers by allowing them into the system and at the same time, not letting latecomers into the system where the latecomer's ad requirements cannot be satisfied without stealing ad opportunities from earlier advertisers, due to the limited expected ad slot inventory. Examiner believes this provides proper motivation to have included a first-come, first-serve policy (which is also and otherwise a well known principle in business) whereby the queue can include prioritization based upon when the various advertisers agreed to ad contracts.

Applicant argues that Carruthers et al's ad selections are based upon calculated goals of each campaign and impressions to date. Examiner notes that the instant invention is also based in part upon such goals and impressions to date (as in claims 4, 5). Applicant's noted disadvantage regarding an inflated number of required ads is not completely eliminated, but rather is eliminated only for those people agreeing to contracts before the inflator agreed to a contract. An inflator still steals ad opportunities from everyone behind the ad inflator.

Applicant argues that it is possible in Carruthers et al for a 2nd advertiser to receive his desired goal through inflation, while a 1st advertiser may not receive his honestly stated goal. This single example appears to be more narrow than applicant's claims which only require a sequence based *in part* on when contracts were agreed upon. Applicant's claims and arguments do not require that sequence of ads be entirely determined by the contract dates.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 571-272-6716. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8a-5:30p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jeffrey D. Carlson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

jdc